

LUC-430/ Mutha.1

16

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a). Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the Office Action states that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. This is because applicants amended the specification in an amendment dated November 2007 to delete the term "signal-bearing" at pages 2 and 16 and to delete the statement "In one example, the computer readable signal-bearing medium comprises a modulated carrier signal transmitted over a network comprising or coupled with the apparatus 100, for instance, one or more of a telephone network, a local area network ("LAN"), the internet, and a wireless network" at page 16. Thus, claim 21 is not directed to transitory propagating signals, and claim 21 is allowable over 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**Rejection Under Sridhar, Thompson, Gonzales and Higgins**

Claims 1-2, 5-11, 14-15 and 19-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Number 6,324,582 issued to Sridhar on November 27, 2001 and U. S. Patent Application Number 2002/0075304 issued to Thompson dated June 20, 2002 and U. S. Patent Number 6,901,139 Issued to Gonzales on May 31, 2005, and further in view of U. S. Patent Application Number 2003/0185169 issued to Higgins dated October 2, 2003.

Applicant has avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

Applicant's claim 1, as amended, now recites,

"one or more server components operable to communicate with one or more router components, wherein the one or more server components are operable to employ one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or

LUC-430/ Mutha 1

17

more router components, and wherein the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of:

a phone number for one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices;

an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices;

an instant message name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; and

a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices;

wherein the one or more server components are operable to assign an internet protocol address to the one or more communication devices, and wherein at least one of the one or more server components comprises one of an optical, a biological, or an atomic data storage medium, and wherein the one or more server components are operable to employ at least one of the one or more identifiers and one or more screening preferences to direct a voice over Internet Protocol (VOIP) call as one of one or more messages or calls through the one or more router components to the one or more communication devices."

As stated in the Office Action, Sridhar, Thompson and Gonzales do not teach or suggest "wherein the one or more server components assign an Internet protocol address to the one or more communication devices".

Sridhar, Thompson, Gonzales and Higgins do not teach or suggest the new limitation either. This is because none of the cited references disclose a server with an optical, a biological, or an atomic data storage medium. Thus, Sridhar, Thompson, Gonzales and Higgins are missing the "wherein at least one of the one or more server components comprises one of an optical, a biological, or an atomic data storage medium" elements, as recited in applicant's claim 1.

Therefore the proposed combination of Sridhar, Thompson, Gonzales and Higgins does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in applicant's claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 2-14 and 22-29 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

LUC-430/ Mutha 1

18

Independent claims 15, 21 and 30 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which, as shown above, is not taught by the proposed combination of Sridhar, Thompson Gonzales and Higgins. For example, claims 15 and 21 recite, "wherein at least one of the one or more server components comprises one of an optical, a biological, or an atomic data storage medium" and claim 30 recites "wherein one of the one or more router components comprises one of an optical, a biological, or an atomic data storage medium". The proposed combination of Sridhar, Thompson Gonzales and Higgins does not teach or suggest these limitations for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claims 15, 21 and 30 are likewise allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 16-20 depend from claim 15, these dependent claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Rejections Under Sridhar, Thompson, Gonzales, Higgins, Conrath, Maes and Brooks

Claims 3-4 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Gonzales, Higgins and Thompson, and further in view of U. S. Patent Number 7,103,770 issued to Conrath on September 5, 2006.

Claims 12, 18 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Thompson, Gonzales, Higgins and Conrath as applied to claims 1-11, 14-17 and 19-21, and further in view of U. S. Patent Number 7,047,305 issued to Brooks on May 16, 2006.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Thompson, Gonzales, Higgins, Conrath, and Brooks as applied to claims 1-12 and 14-21, and further in view of U. S. Patent Number 6,801,604 issued to Maes on October 5, 2004.

Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection.

These rejections are based on the rejection under Sridhar, Thompson, Gonzales and Higgins being proper. As that ground of rejection has been overcome, and none of the cited references teach or suggest "wherein at least one of the one or more server components comprises one of an optical, a biological, or an atomic data storage medium", as recited in applicant's independent claims 1, 15 and 21, and "wherein one of the one or more router components comprises one of an optical, a biological, or an

LUC-430/ Mutha 1

19

atomic data storage medium", as recited in applicant's independent claim 30, the combination of Sridhar, Thompson, Gonzales, Higgins, Conrath, Maes and Brooks does not supply these missing elements. Thus, these combinations do not make obvious any of applicant's claims, all of which require the aforesaid limitations.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



James Milton
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,935

Dated: June 29, 2010

CARMEN PATTI LAW GROUP, LLC
Customer Number 47382
(312) 346-2800